

PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Pursuant to Section 18.94 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Executive Committee** was held on Monday, July 9, 2012 in Room 200 of the Northern Building – 305 East Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin

Present: Tom Lund, Patrick Moynihan, Jr., Pat Buckley, Bernie Erickson, Pat Evans, Steve Fewell, Pat Wetzel

Also Present: Supervisors Kaster, Steffen, Williams, Schuller, Van Dyck, Landwehr. Executive Streckenbach. Brent Miller, Paul Van Noie, Doug Marsh, Brian Shoup, Paula Kazik, Darlene Marcelle, Sandy Juno, Maria Lasecki, Fred Mohr, Other Interested Parties, Media.

I. Call Meeting to Order:

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Tom Lund at 6:10 p.m.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda:

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Wetzel to modify agenda to take items #13-19 after item #7. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to modify the agenda to move item #23 before item #10. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

III. Approve/modify minutes of June 11, 2012.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Wetzel to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Appointments

1. Appointment of Supervisor Tom Sieber to Land Information Council.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Communications

2. Communication from Supervisor Steffen re: Term-limits for Brown County Supervisors. *Held for one month.*

Supervisor Steffen stated he was hoping this committee would show support to his communication as it was important for their county and democracy to have term limits for positions. He felt their democracy was better served, more people who were serving it and he was hoping they could do their part to foster participation with his communications tonight. There was a question as to, and it wasn't fully explored by Corporation Counsel as to whether a county or municipality had the ability to self-impose term limits. Whether or not you can they could still show their support by self-impose on or authorize a resolution requesting the state legislator to allow counties or municipalities to take that step. He felt it was positive for democracy and positive for participation, he would like to see more people a part of this process.

Moynihan felt due to the legalities because it's far more stringent of an item that it would supersede

State Statute. Steffen stated perhaps Corporation Counsel could weigh in on it, it would be helpful.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. No Vote taken.

Wetzel questioned if they could do this or was it in the State Statutes that they could or couldn't, he'd like to find that out before they received and placed it on file.

Erickson stated he spoke with the attorney, they were the arm of the state, and this was a state requirement. He didn't understand why they wanted to override what the state put down. There were no term limits according to the state.

Supervisor Buckley arrived at 6:13 p.m.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Wetzel to refer to Corporation Counsel for disposition of communication. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

3. **Communication from Supervisor Steffen re: Nomination signature threshold for candidates seeking the office of County Supervisor to lower to 50 and 100 signatures. *Held for one month.***

Steffen believed they were better served to have additional competition and participation at this level. He felt by dropping the limit, which was allowed by law according to the Government Accountability Board (GAB), they had the ability to drop it to 50. One additional benefit, he felt could be helpful to those disabled or senior citizens, those who don't feel comfortable in that one month in the winter, often in the dark going door to door to get signatures. He felt it was about allowing, encouraging, fostering additional participation in the part of government. He was hopeful that the committee was supportive of dropping to 50 signatures.

Buckley informed that the city only required 20 signatures. He liked 100 because you end up taking to the people and spending time with them. It's a good time for the people to get a chance to talk with you one on one. He believed each district had around 9,000 people, so in some cases it was really about 50 households if you have husband and wife, etc.

Erickson agreed with Supervisor Buckley, he felt even 200 would be acceptable. You could get 100 signatures in about two evenings, which was very minimal. If there was an individual unable to get around, they had the opportunity to have other people obtain signatures, it could be done. It was a golden opportunity to get out and speak with constituents.

Wetzel stated he understood where Steffen was coming from it was spelt out, they could do it, it was legal. If he had to get 50, he would still get 100.

Fewell stated the earlier communication was to encourage more people to run, if it was 50 it may encourage more to run. Supervisors that go out and get 100, usually they get 200. If the goal was to encourage more people to run he would be in support of 50.

Evans stated he would stay with 100, he didn't feel people ran for office because there were term limits or because it was easy to get signatures. As a constituent, he was more interested in someone who had the passion to run. He felt lowering it was another way of diminishing the supervisor position and that was bothersome to him. He took this position very serious. Being a County Board Supervisor meant something, they had a lot of say and do make a lot of hard decisions.

Steffen felt there were minimal tools to encourage additional participation at this level. He could respect Evans comments regarding passion but he was far more interested in having the best and

the brightest making decisions for the county of 250,000 people they represent. He didn't want that determined on whether they were able bodied or not. He didn't care if they were half in it but they were the smartest people who supplied the best input. He didn't know if this community was better served by having people serve 20, 30, 40 years in the same position. Steffen felt there was value in both the term limits and signature limit.

Buckley agreed on the term limit part but with regard to the signature limit, in all the people he had talked to about running, getting signatures was never a factor, it was always based on what they saw on TV or experienced at meetings, etc.

Motion made by Supervisor Buckley, seconded by Supervisor Evans to receive and place on file. Vote taken. Ayes: 6 (Evans, Erickson, Lund, Moynihan, Buckley, Fewell); Nays: 1 (Wetzel).

4. **Communication from Supervisor Steffen: Review, discuss and take action on requiring standardized, staff reports for public policy items and monthly reports. *Referred from June County Board.***

Steffen would like to see a standardized report from staff, a coversheet, for any report that came before each committee and be available in advance. He felt some of the info was not standardized. He felt having all issues clearly defined in advance and provided was important. Too many meetings information was provided orally. He felt that was not helpful to the public who were not in attendance. If it was important enough to discuss, it was important to put in writing. It was an important element to allow them to be more prepared, he felt questions would be answered ahead of time, meetings would go faster. It would have additional accountability and more transparency.

Evans could see the benefits and felt a report broken down would be beneficial especially for new supervisors. He would like to see some more explanation involved. He saw the benefit in this type of structure and supported the concept. He suggested sending this to Board Chairman and vice-chairman to take a look at. He could see enhancing more of what they were doing.

Erickson liked the concept, had merit, could see this done but would like it condensed, detailed down to a single page.

Wetzel stated he liked the idea and was in support.

Moynihan could see the benefits and liked it as well.

Fewell felt they should standardize the form for staff as well as for communications and supervisors.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Wetzel to send to County Board Chairman Moynihan and County Board Vice-Chairman Lund and work in concert with Administration. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

5. **Communication from Supervisor Robinson re: Request that the County Board (1) hold a special visioning session or series of visioning sessions and (2) consider putting together a Master Plan to guide the work of County Government. *Held for one month to bring back additional information.***

Information provided and attached.

Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

6. **Communication from Supervisor Sieber re: To have Human Resources include their rationale for the salary assigned to any new department head in the packet which the County Board receives prior to confirmation vote.**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

The committee returned to this item after item 23 as Supervisor Seiber was present.

Sieber stated at the County Board meetings when Directors were approved, salaries were put in front of them. He was hoping to see the homework that HR did to pick these salaries and have them attached to their packets so they are able to view their salary justifications.

Brent Miller informed that he would bring the form forward next month. He informed that it went through how every position was rated, what the grades were in, based on experience, education, responsibilities, budget impact and the impact of your decisions.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to reconsider Communication #6. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Wetzel to refer to next month's Executive Committee to have staff provide their point factoring information. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Item #10 was taken at this time.

7. **Communication from Supervisor Moynihan re: Request approval of amending Brown County Code of Ordinances 2.13 (5)(f) to delete "and discussion pertinent to the subject matter". *Referred from June County Board.***

Moynihan informed that this communication was in concert to what was provided at Administration Committee having to do with streaming and archiving video and audio. Until they get those answers from Information Services he would like to hold for 60 days.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Wetzel to hold for 60 days. Vote taken. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Items #13-19 were taken at this time.

Request for Approval

8. **Public Works Director's Report on Central Library Maintenance Assessment. *Referred from Library Board Informational Meeting and PD&T.***

Van Noie informed that he had brought the report forward for informational purposes. He felt most of the info prior to this talked about deferred maintenance. They took in an essence the facility condition study that was done in 2009 along with efforts from their facility team where they went out and reviewed each of the items and spent time with the facility management at the library and tried to categorize the best they could in specific definitions. They broke it in four groups: safety, deferred maintenance (definition in packet material), planned maintenance (over a 5-year period), and capital improvements. They concluded that basically the safety and deferred maintenance issues were approximately \$801,000, plan maintenance at \$1.879M for those three categories, and the balance of the \$3.5M/\$3.6M were basically capital improvements. They believed that those were

the expenses that would be necessary to put the central library into solid working condition.

Moynihan referred to pg. 9, Exhibit C, #3. Book Drop Modifications, in the comment area there was verbiage pertaining to security issues, would that not be something they wanted to move to a higher priority. Van Noie informed that the conversation he had dealt with the possibility of someone dropping an explosive device in the book shoot. He wasn't sure how you could affectively deal with that. He didn't think there was an appropriate solution at this time. He felt people may look at this and move things around. It was their best attempt.

Erickson stated he had several discussions with Mr. Van Noie and had attended several library meetings, and read the report over several times and to get everything back over the next 5 years, \$1.879M, they budgeted \$1.5M for repair and or renovation. On this \$1.875M they have \$375,000 already in this year's budget; they were backed down almost to do the complete repair job for what was bonded for at the \$1.5M. Moynihan responded \$375,000 was budgeted in November towards those repairs. Erickson stated subtract the \$375,000 from the \$1.879 they would have that covered. He added this was a report that they had been asking for for several years and never had, it was an eye opener. He felt they should consider taking a thorough look at this.

Wetzel questioned how does the maintenance assessment relate to the RFP for \$1.5M? Back in February he had asked what they were actually talking about with the library with the \$17/\$18M and he had asked what they absolutely needed to fix and the number was around \$12M and a lot had to do with the HVAC. What does this report mean for the next item? If they use the \$1.5M it did not take the RFP off the table. Van Noie responded that the \$3.5M was aggregated in the report. Basically deals with building maintenance issues. The difference between that and the \$12.5M were program related issues. Not necessary to have a good sound building but maybe necessary to have a good sound library program. He did not review anything with regard to library programs, just building conditions.

Buckley stated that when he looked at this and looked at the \$15-\$18M, he would like to hear from the people from the library to explain the other bearings. Lund responded that they will do that under item 9. This report was just a guideline of what the building needed to move forward.

Fewell questioned where the numbers came from. Van Noie stated they started with the Boldt Facility Management Assessment, they had similar look and arrange of items but he felt it was obscured, it was buried in documentations. They also called people and used their facility team that had some background and knowledge in HVAC and electrical. They used whatever intelligence they could gather. There were some ranges and he took the high end ranges on the table.

Kaster informed that he was one of the supervisors looking for a report like this, a different view. This report and the Library Board agreed that the superstructure and foundation are in great shape, the building was a great building. This report addressed everything. He couldn't understand taking these huge jumps and revamping the whole building; they could be responsible to the taxpayer, take care of our facilities and do this in a responsible way. He didn't believe the library would be slighted. This will take care of everything plus more, furniture, etc. Kaster felt it was a very good report and everyone should take a serious look at it and consider it.

Evans appreciated the report and the info, they did a great job. He supported the library and fought for the library for years. He felt this issue was similar to the Mental Health Center discussion, stating it was a great building, he felt it was a bunker. After doing additional research, times had changed, functionality of the facility needed to change. Evans appreciated everything in the report, he didn't disagree with anything, but it showed that their facility was in very rough shape. He considered himself a conservative and didn't have a problem spending money wisely. He looked at the functionality of the library, library system, what it will be 10 years from now. You hear that what

they had now was a functional space was extremely antiquated. If they were going to spend money, they should do it the correct way. Evans supported the RFP and felt it would bring back information people weren't expecting. Two main points: 1. Yes, this facility was in great need; 2. it was basically an antiquated facility both physically and the functionality of it.

Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Wetzel to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

9. **Central Library RFP.**

Library Board Members: John Hickey, Dr. Watermolen, Lynn Stainbrook

Hickey informed that the process they used in 2009 in reviewing the building assessment report, it was part of their process that began over 5 years ago which got them to where they were now. It was decided that after reviewing these reports the Central Library was past the point of patchwork repair and the systematic approach was necessary to avoid wasting taxpayer's funds and constant disruption of the library system. It was mentioned a number of times that the facility was not in compliance with federal regulations and had to be brought up to standards if significant alterations start to be made. This decision wasn't made by only the Library Board members; the Library Board had County Board members on it over the years. The decision was made in conjunction with the County Executive, County Board committees, and former county facilities people. They went the next step which brought them to now.

Stainbrook provided a handout (attached) re: changes made by Admin, Ed & Rec and PD&T Committee to the RFP for Central Library Final Design and walked through the changes with the committee. With regard to the design process that would include input from the County Board, Library Staff, County Public Works Facility, Engineers, Director, as they go through the different parts of the structure either remodeled/repared the Public Works Department, County Board Supervisors and people from the community will be involved. That would be Friends of the Library as well as people who are not part of the library staff or board who have their own ideas. They had talked to the City of Green Bay to see if they could do something in conjunction with them since they were doing a lot of work downtown at the same time, etc. They were working with Downtown Green Bay, people who have the businesses downtown. There were a lot of ideas. They would like to see some joint work with departments in the county such as the Museum. They were hoping that they could get together and have everyone come in with a clear view and see if there was a better way to serve the public in that process, at a lower cost and still have what they need. What that may be, they have ideas but hope everyone had an open mind. They would like the committee to approve the RFP so they can move forward with the design services, take the next step, etc.

Buckley questioned what they were thinking as far as cooperation with the museum. Hickey felt there could be discussions with moving their history section over to the museum. This would be part of the design process. Stainbrook informed that the RFP included a target value engineering piece and this was a core to it. It had four County Board members who agreed to be on the steering committee and all had stakeholders that would be helping out with that as well. Looking at the Target value engineering is the piece where they look at a program item and have input as to a holistic approach of what needed to be done, should be done, and could be done vs. the cost of doing that. There will be buy in from the County Board members and the community as to how far the process should go, what they should include and how much they want to pay for in that process. Buckley was confused on why they were spending \$1.5M to discuss what they wanted to do in the library. To him they should figure it out before spending \$1.5M. Watermolen interjected that these costs went back to 2009 and they found out they had problems, to the Library Board, if they were going to recommend spending money to repair something and still end up with a non-functional building, it wasn't a wise use of taxpayers' dollars, they then said let's look at what the options are and if they were going to spend \$300,000 on elevators, they needed to have a plan. In order to get

that plan they go through this process which should end up giving them the best value on the taxpayers' dollars. He couldn't imagine anyone being comfortable putting \$3.5M in and ending up with the exact same thing they had four years ago. You may end up doing that but the RFP will come up with the options on the end, basic repair and what it would take to do that and what it would take with basic repair that would fit in a long range plan. If they were going to spend that kind of money they needed a master plan, there was great input from all the boards they had been before on what they would like to see. This process allowed for that, what would this option do and how much would it cost, etc. Buckley questioned if they could have a similar report to the one Van Noie provided for the program side before spending \$1.5M. They already know what had to be fixed but what they were going to do with the program side, they seemed like they didn't really have a direction. Stainbrook stated they did but it cost \$23M so they had to cut that down. Buckley felt they were going to have supervisors not agree to spend \$23M on the facility and the \$1.5M will sit on a shelf. They would be better off on the program side to have a report of what they agree was a necessity for the library. Stainbrook informed that the \$1.5M included the target value design process but also included doing all of the engineering work which wasn't included in what had to do to do the things in the repair process and they all had to be engineered correctly. They don't want to do the engineering part until they know exactly what the program statement was going to be, and using consultants who were qualified to be able to do that. Purchasing Department stated in order to do construction bids they had to have specifications detailed out before they could put that bid out there. Buckley questioned if they had to have an engineer study to make the repairs that were outlined in the report. Van Noie felt Stainbrook was talking about the entire project. Van Noie felt individual pieces could be dealt with by vendors that had their own staff engineers that could bring in solutions. That was Buckley's experience in the commercial side. He was trying to extinguish between needs and wants. Stainbrook informed the target value design would do that. Watermolen stated that they needed to have the engineering design on what part of the building needed to be changed, how they will do it, how they will meet code before they can do anything. Once they have this, they had the choice to do the minimal amount to meet safety and code requirements, ADA, asbestos, lighting and all the things they had to do and not proceed with the rest at that point that they had a plan. There may be grants out there that could be added to the basic amount or could do in-house. When this is done, everyone will have all the input to know what the end project should look like and how far to proceed. Buckley's concern was spending the \$1.5M on a project when the \$1.5M could have been spent on the repairs. He'd rather see a report on the program similar to what facilities gave them for the repair-end of it. The other part of it, it would be nice to have a levy impact on different options on what it would cost them. Watermolen responded that they didn't know the cost yet but they could do that, once they get this done they will have actual numbers.

Fewell stated he still struggled with RFP process and not that they shouldn't get the cost, but when you look at the numbers, look at what it costs to build libraries, they were looking at spending \$1.5M to get a plan to renovate the library. If they were to spend \$18M on the library they would be spending about \$200 a sq. ft. If they were to spend \$17M it would be \$189 per sq. ft. They were told they could build a brand new library for \$150 per sq. ft. If Green Bay would step up with some land they could build a new building for cheaper that was designed for their programming. He's not against spending money or against the Library Board; he wanted to do in the end what was best for the community and for the long run. If they were going to retrofit a building and spend more dollars per square foot then he won't vote for it.

Wetzel assumed if they approved the RFP then they were spending \$1.5M, he didn't feel that was the case. He felt they were asking what it would cost. How much would it cost to put the RFP out? They could approve the RFP, have vendors come back with a price and the County Board could say no and still have the \$1.5M. He was in favor of the RFP because they could still say no. He felt an RFP was just a request for your proposal and if they don't like the proposal they could say no. He felt they could still have those discussions on this maintenance report and what they wanted to have in the meantime and still say no.

Van Dyck believed physical condition and the issues within the library was the whole driving force behind this whole process not necessarily functionality. They had a report from facilities which stated it would cost \$3M-\$4M. Is engineering included in there, no, according to the one study it was 10% of the cost, around \$400,000. It was a far cry from what they were told the necessary repairs would cost, \$9-\$12M. Even if facilities were off 10% they were still looking at \$4/\$5M for necessary repairs. The driving force behind the whole process was that this building needed to be renovation for safety concerns. He understood that there was talk about fixing things from a program standpoint; he didn't think this RFP was necessary to come up with new ideas. There was a BC Central Library Space Needs Analysis from 2008, a BC Central Library Boldt Engineering Assessment Final Report from 2009, a BC Central Library Renovation Cost Analysis from 2012, he questioned how many reports did they needed. Everything the Library Board and the people that had input were all there. If they were going to approve \$1.5M RFP they mine as well plan on approving an \$18M renovation plan. It made no sense to spend \$1.5M to find out that they need \$4M dollars in repairs, it had already been done.

Erickson stated he had been voting at committee in favor of the RFP but did not see this report until Friday, he agreed with Van Dyck.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve.

Fewell informed that he didn't like the RFP process the way it was, if they were looking at coming up with a design and cost at \$17/\$18M why weren't they comparing that to building new as well in the RFP, he felt that should be considered. If it came back that the renovation was in the neighborhood of \$17/\$18M it would be too much per square foot for him to support renovating that building. If it came in a lot less, then he would entertain it. Fewell felt building new needed to be included in the RFP, it needed to be compared to what they were doing as far as renovation costs.

Motion made by Supervisor Fewell, seconded by Supervisor Evans to amend the motion to approve with the addition of adding building new as an option in the RFP.

Ayes: 5 (Evans, Lund, Moynihan, Wetzell, Fewell);

Nay: 2 (Buckley, Erickson). MOTION PASSED

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to suspend the rules to take item 12b with item 23. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Items 12b & 23 were taken at this time.

Supervisor Fewell was excused at 7:55pm.

Legal Bills

10. **Review and Possible Action on Legal Bills to be paid.**

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Evans to pay the bills. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Reports

11. **County Executive Report.**

a) **Budget Update.**

Executive Streckenbach informed that as they were working on the budget they anticipated a \$3.5M structural deficit. \$1.1M was due to new debt with increase in bonding. The debt payments were approximately \$16.5M of their levy is in debt payments that increase by \$1.1M. \$900,000 was a

one-time funding through the Highway Fund Balance which brought them to \$2M. Operational cost of roughly \$1.5M. They were waiting to see where WRS contribution rates were going estimated at .5%-.9% increase which equated to \$360,000-\$700,000. He hoped around a \$500,000 cost as they weren't calculating it initially. This was something that just came out within the last two weeks. They also found out there was a possibility that they can't change the scope, the prisons may not be getting any funding, which would be another cost that they would have to absorb that they weren't prepared for. He wanted it cognizant that every cost they were increasing, they had to find \$3.5M to cut out of the budget in order to keep the cost to continue the way it was. It was one thing they had to address one way or the other. He was bringing it to their attention that for every dollar they increase, it's something they would have to fund.

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

12. **Labor Attorney Report.**

a) **Healthcare Plan 2013.**

Fred Mohr informed that with ObamaCare they had to submit by September their plan document. Their 3rd party administrator wanted to get the County Board's approval to move forward with the progression they were following. In 2009 they had been trying to move people off the PPO on the high deductible plan. They had a migration about 25%. In 2013 their plan was to go entirely to the high deductible plan. The county will fund using excess of the health care plan and offset with a HRA contribution what the additional cost would be for the deductible the first year. By shifting to the high deductible plan, the employee impact would be negligible the first year. The net effect was a terrific cost savings should save the county around \$1.7M if they made this conversion hoping to offset the huge deficit. They would like the committee to give them direction to move forward toward moving everyone to the high deductible plan in 2013. 2014 would have to determine and make a recommendation to you of what percentage of the high deductible they will fund with the HRA. The deductibles on the PPO plan are currently \$750 per family, \$250 single, they will go up to \$3,000 for family, \$1,500 single but the county will pay 80% of the \$2,400 toward an HSA to fund the deductible. Employees will actually gain. The high deductible is cheaper.

Streckenbach informed that the performance of the high deductible had shown that the intent behind it had been working for the counties benefit. Their goal was after they monitor it next year to come back, when they find out how the performance was, and then it would vary between 80% & 50% depending on how well the county employees take care of themselves.

Buckley's concern would be that they had a lower deductible and then in 2014 employees get hit. Mohr stated that the belief was and projections were that if they shift people to the high deductible plan they will have the same experience and success with the 25% that already did. If that occurred then they would be closer up to the 80%. Since 2009 in health today, basically the cost to the county for medical insurance had dropped by millions. They had saved millions by shifting the responsibility for intelligent healthcare to the employee. It's worked well.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Wetzel to approve adopting the high deductible plan for 2013. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

b) **Discussion of Chapter 4 Revisions. See item #23**

Vacant Budgeted Positions (Request to Fill)

- 13. **Child Support – Accounting Technician – vacated 6/2012**
- 14. **County Clerk – Account Clerk – vacated 6/2012**
- 15. **Human Services/CTC – Clerk III – vacated 5/2012**

16. Human Services/CTC – Food Service Supervisor (.5 FTE) – vacated 6/2012
17. Human Services – Social Worker/Case Manager – Adult LTC – vacated 5/2012
18. Human Services – Social Worker/Case Manager – Child Protection Intake/Ongoing x2 - vacated 3/2012 & 6/2012
19. Public Works/Facility Management – Clerk Typist II – vacated 6/2012

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Fewell to suspend the rules to take 13 through 19 as one item.

Ayes: 6 (Evans, Erickson, Lund, Moynihan, Wetzel, Fewell);

Nays: 1 (Buckley). MOTION PASSED

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Evans to approve items 13 through 19.

Ayes: 6 (Evans, Erickson, Lund, Moynihan, Wetzel, Fewell);

Nays: 1 (Buckley). MOTION PASSED

Back to item 8 at this time.

Resolutions, Ordinances

20. Resolution re: Authority to Execute a 2012 Labor Agreement with the Brown County Human Services Professional Employees Association.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

21. Resolution re: Authority to Execute a 2012 Labor Agreement with the Brown County Human Services Para-Professional Employees Association.

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

22. Resolution re: the Reclassification of the Director of Port and Solid Waste Position. *Held for one month.*

Motion made by Supervisor Erickson, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

23. Ordinance to Amend Chapter 4 of the Brown County Code entitled “Personnel Rules and Regulations”.

Fred Mohr provided a handout, a copy of which is attached, and briefly went through the changes.

Miller wished to comment that the department heads met with the County Executive and Fred Mohr and many of the department heads were in attendance at the meeting in support of this. This was an intensive and thorough process.

Buckley stated that he still had concerns with regard to inverting employees who may be on a short week and therefore do not get overtime pay but are still being forced to stay. He has an issue with this as he knows that it can be an inconvenience to employees and their families. He stated he brought this up with one of the department heads that has this problem, but the department head was unable to tell him how much they were spending on inverse overtime. Buckley felt that when the County is forcing an employee to be there or forcing them to come in early, they should be compensated. Mohr responded that he would like the same data that Buckley wants and that data

he did have has been checked with records but does not correspond. Mohr continued that if the numbers are what he thinks they are, he would consider recommending that time and a half be paid on inverse, but he cannot make that recommendation without knowing what the true numbers are. Buckley felt that the department heads should be able to figure out a pretty good guess on the numbers from their payrolls. He stated that he had received e mails from employees who have had four of five days worked and can be inversed. Buckley wondered if this shows there is a problem in the department overall, and if there is, he felt that it was being taken out on the employees by inversing.

Streckenbach stated that this was discussed previously and he would like to have three months to work with departments to address the issues of the 24/7 operations mandatory staffing requirements. Streckenbach stated that they are continuing to work on that and there are still a lot of things that need to be discussed. He continued that they had a meeting at the Sheriff's Department recently which was attended by about 75% of the department heads and thereafter and thereafter another meeting was held which was attended by about 80% of department heads. At these meetings they discussed how to handle overtime after eight hours, the issues with multiple start times and the work week schedule as well as holidays. The consensus was that there needs to be continued discussion as to how to address management issues and they would like to find a way to prevent the inversing from happening, but more importantly, how to prevent staff from potentially working 14 hours in one shift. Streckenbach continued that he wants to start to look at how the County is addressing scheduling and have the opportunity to come back to the Committee in 2 ½ months to report the findings and discuss solutions as to how to address the findings. Buckley asked Streckenbach if he would support paying inversed employees time and a half until a solution is reached. Streckenbach answered that they would have to address how this would impact the budget, but stated that he knows one department for sure that does not want that because they have their scheduling under control and this could impact their budget. Buckley felt that staffing issues have been long neglected in one department in particular and this is being taken out on the employees. Mohr did not feel that they could authorize something that will have a temporary fiscal impact and he stated that when an ordinance is passed it is not necessary to include a fiscal impact, but if the Committee were to pass a temporary thing such as inversing at time and a half, there would have to be a resolution with a fiscal impact. Streckenbach felt that inversing was a management issue. Buckley understood but stated that in the Communication Center there is no choice but to have bodies in the chairs and if this matter is not addressed the issues with personnel will continue. Mohr felt that within a month they should have data as to how often this happens and then costs can be figured out as to how much this is costing and at that point suggestions could be made as to how to accomplish a solution. Buckley stated that he is not comfortable with Chapter 4 until this issue is addressed.

Buckley continued that his other concern was why employees will be given another half a holiday but then have a personal day taken away. Mohr stated that they are not taking away a whole personal day. What was done is they would take away the equivalent of what they are gaining. In other words, they are gaining a half day but then a half personal day will be taken away.

With regard to the grievance procedure, Wetzel wanted to know if there would be any costs incurred by an employee in the event of an appeal. Mohr stated that it would depend on what the cost for the impartial hearing would be and continued that the County would select the impartial hearing panel and presumably find someone to do it for no cost if possible.

Wetzel also had a question concerning funeral leave. He wanted to know what the explanation was for reducing funeral leave from five days to three days for immediate family members and he questioned if they could add a caveat that funeral leave could go up to five with department head approval. Mohr stated that as a practical matter an employee would not be forced to return to work

until they can be productive. Mohr continued that this type of issue is looked at on a case by case basis and there would be flexibility if necessary. The intent of this change was to standardize the leave and in looking at comparables they found that three days was the standard. Wetzel asked if the flexibility referred to would mean that the employee would have to use vacation and Mohr stated they could take it as vacation or personal time off.

Moynihan pointed out that from the Executive's perspective this is still a work in progress. Streckenbach stated that there was a lot of time spent on what is currently before the Committee but he also acknowledged that all of the issues and concerns that are being addressed are not necessarily resolved at this time. He pointed out that this is a living document that can be changed at any given time and major changes have been made which will allow stability in the budget process. He also stated that they have discussed many of the issues brought up by staff but also noted that there are costs associated with all of these issues. Streckenbach stated that at the last Executive Committee meeting it was recommended that staff come back in September with a report as to how to address the issues with the 24/7 departments. Current issues such as the inverting need more time to be examined and they will come back with those as well.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to open the floor to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Supervisor Williams stated that he agreed with Buckley in that we need to look at how employees are being compensated for the hours that they work. He understood what it takes to work in a 24/7 operation because he has done it and he acknowledged that they have to give up family time as well as weekends off. He understood that it is difficult to find people to work those hours due to the sacrifice of family time. He felt the County employees working in the 24/7 departments are providing a great service for the County and are giving up a lot and he felt this needs to be looked at closely.

Patricia Perez – 2814 N. New Franken Rd, New Franken, WI

Perez stated that she works in the Communication Center and has addressed both the Executive and Public Safety Committees before and she appreciates everybody looking at Chapter 4 and reviewing it. She stated that the Brown County Communication Center is the best in Wisconsin and is looked at frequently for comparison purposes. She stated that every single day employees are being inverted and forced in four hours before or after their shifts. This is not a new situation. She stated that they have 60 people who are being forced in on 12 hour shifts and this is burning the younger people out and she does not feel they will stay unless they are properly compensated. With regard to weekends off, she stated that they have some portion of a weekend off every three months. She acknowledged that Mohr said they do not work as many days as other employees and she understands that, but they also do not have time off with their families. She appreciates that these things are being looked at and also appreciates the fact that the Committee is standing up for them and bringing back further ideas. Perez also stated that they could get the numbers regarding inverting by looking at their schedules and stated that the inverted hours are highlighted in red. She stated that most shifts on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday and Monday are 12 hour shifts and most are inverted.

Mark Zeratski , 3030 Curry Lane

Zeratski is a correctional officer and stated that he also appreciates all the work that has been done on Chapter 4. He stated his biggest issue is the work week. He does not understand how it is legal or ethical to work over 40 hours in a week and not be paid overtime. He still has not heard any response on this from Mohr or the Board. He has heard excuses that it causes problems in the computer system but pointed out that this program has been used for 20 years. He acknowledged that they work 10 less days through the year, but the work week is not a short work week. It is 40

hours. He also continued that they do not have as much overtime as the Telecommunicators, but he is seeing more people being forced for overtime in the last 6 – 7 months.

George Frye, 3030 Curry Lane

Frye is a correctional officer and stated he felt more people would sign and volunteer for overtime if it was compensated fairly at time and a half. If it is not compensated at time and a half people feel it is not worth giving up time with family to come in. He also felt there were other options that he has not heard discussed that people who do not work in their operation understand. He explained that personal days do not work the same for them as they do for other people in the County. They have to pick what shift they want to work the following year and what days they want off a year in advance and then they look at their calendars and pick vacation time and personal days for the following year. If someone is already on vacation on a day they would like to use a personal day, they are unable to use the personal day and these are then lost at the end of the year and Frye felt this was unfair. He also brought up the fact that they have to go to training on off days, but they do not know ahead of time when it will be. Often this shows up in the middle of scheduled vacation time. He said that they do try to work around this, but what has been happening lately is training is scheduled on off days on the short time card period so you have to come in on your day off and get paid straight time. He also does not understand how Mohr explains how holidays work. For a Monday through Friday person with weekends off, if a holiday falls on their workday, they get the day off. If the holiday falls on their day off, they get another day off with pay at a different time during the week and if at any time you have to come in and work on the holiday it is at premium pay. He thought maybe the only fair way is to make everyone in the County go on a 5/2, 5/3 schedule and have services available in the County seven days a week to force other departments to work what they have to work.

Sheriff John Gossage

Sheriff Gossage thanked the men and women in public safety for all they do. He stated that what Supervisor Williams said is true in that these employees are giving up time spent with their families. He recognized that this comes with the job and the territory but he did not feel this could be compared with the 5/2 employees. Gossage also wished to clarify that when the department heads got together as a group, they did not agree on the four hour personal day. He continued that he does not want to see the County start to lose good employees. He explained that there is a 16 week training period for corrections staff and that it is expensive to do background investigations and train individuals. He also does not want to see the County lose the experience that staff brings to the various positions. Gossage felt the work the corrections staff and telecommunication staff does is imperative to public safety and he would like to ensure that we retain the good employees we have. He also stated that he agreed with Supervisor Evans' statement that he does not mind spending money on wise investments and felt that good personnel was a wise investment. He applauded the County Executive for pulling the department heads together to be able to discuss this and felt that we are moving in the right direction. Gossage also advised Supervisor Buckley that he will start to pull statistics on inverting from his agency to find out what the fiscal impact is.

Tina Baker, 3028 Curry Lane

Tina Baker stated that she was a telecommunicator. She is hearing the suggestion that this be brought back in September to talk about again, but what she is thinking is that in the meantime her incentive is being taken away to answer her phone and say she will come in when needed. Ultimately she felt that this is making her hurt her coworkers and what will begin to happen is 16 hour shifts because people won't answer their phones to come in. She felt this would cause a snowball effect in that if there is no incentive to come in and work, she will not be answering the phone and she added that she is not the only person who feels this way. She felt it was imperative that this issue be dealt with right now and not be put off any longer. She felt this was over talked about and has dragged on too long. She also felt that people are becoming physically ill from working so many hours. They have several people that are on eight hour restrictions. When people

are restricted to eight hour shifts because they are told they cannot work any longer, there is nobody left to inverse. They are starting to see 14 and 16 hour shifts. She also stated that they are losing intelligent experienced people because of this. Further she felt that this may lead to bad media if errors start happening because workers are tired.

Supervisor Tom Sieber

Supervisor Sieber felt that working 16 hour days and 60 hours a week was too much and he felt that the County needs to do the right thing and further, this has gone on way too long. He felt that if employees were forced in after eight hours that they need to be compensated at overtime for that. He does not know of any other job where you would work more than 40 hours in a week and not get paid overtime. He would like to see language passed tonight if at all possible addressing forced overtime and the short work week. He also had a question with regard to 4.71 and 4.72 and was wondering if there was a County policy and, if so, where it would be as he would like to see this. Mohr stated that this would be contained in the employee handbook. Sieber then asked what the difference was between Chapter 4 and the employee handbook. Mohr stated that they are similar but the intent of Chapter 4 is setting the upper bar of the general policy while the employee handbook is more specific as to each department.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Evans asked for clarification on the short work week. Mohr responded that what happened was they determined a work week, starting on a certain day. Because they are on a 15 day rotating schedule of 5/2, 5/3, what can happen is they can overlap on weeks so technically within that timeframe they may be scheduled to only work four days. If they are called in to work a fifth day in that timeframe they are not getting overtime. They could occasionally work six days in a row but it would be spread over two pay periods and this is what they are referring to as the short week and saying that they are being shortchanged. What they are requesting is that the work week not start on one particular day but rather be started on the day that they start to work. The County has more than 600 employees working in 24/7 departments and this would result in an administrative nightmare and Mohr is not aware of any other operation anywhere near the size of Brown County that has a rotating work week. What is done in Brown County is determine when the work week starts and then do this uniformly down the line so if they work more than 40 hours in that week they get paid overtime but it just so happens that they may work a Saturday but then work five days in the next work week. Evans asked if this practice violates any fair labor laws and Mohr said that labor laws are absolutely not being violated and furthermore, the vast majority of operations work this same way. Evans said it seems to him that employees are being taken advantage of if they are not getting paid time and a half.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to suspend the rules to allow interested parties to speak. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

Mark Zeratski, 3030 Curry Lane

Zeratski stated that until January 1 scheduling had been done the same way for about 20 years. He also said that the pay period starts on a Saturday and runs through Thursday. This is five days in a row, but the time card does not show that; it just shows that the new pay period starts on Sunday so it looks like he worked four hours that pay period, but he has actually worked five days in a row and this is where the confusion comes.

Heather Tiedtke, 3028 Curry Lane

Tiedtke had an example of what a four month rotation would look like. Lund asked how many

times in a four month rotation an employee would have a short pay period and Tiedtke said that would happen every other week. Tiedtke continued that the acknowledgement of their work week would go a long way to retaining staff and showing some appreciation of the work they do. She did acknowledge that the Committees have complimented their work and shown some verbal appreciation, but she said that sometimes the words fall short of the actions and there is a lot of frustration on their end. She noted that she first met with the Public Safety Committee in May, 2011 and has been to 19 meetings. She has worked in the department for 11 years and stated that if this is not resolved soon her experience may no longer be available to constituents. She concluded by stating that this has been a long road to haul and they are routinely working 60 hour weeks.

Tina Baker

Baker stated that before they went to this Chapter 4 there were 1,960 hours for a 5/2, 5/3. This was divided and they were paid 76 hours one week and 80 hours the next week and anything over eight hours was time and a half. This is the way it was done for many, many years and this is also how GBPD does it. She stated that to take away the time and a half when you volunteer to come in is going to hurt the next co-worker as she will not come in on straight time to alleviate pressure from her co-workers and she felt that this will result in the junior people being hammered.

Jennifer von Haden, 3030 Curry Lane

von Haden stated that she figured out the hours for their work weeks. When they were getting paid the 76 hours per pay period as Baker mentioned, they had 1,976 hours per year when in actuality one group works 2,001 hours so they are actually getting paid less than they work and she felt that this was offsetting some of the getting paid for overtime after eight hours. The other group works 1,993 hours and when you count in the Monday through Friday people, she used 7.5 holidays and for the hours they work, their hours will change because whether the Monday through Friday people work the holiday or not, they still work it. So they are still working the 2,001 hours while the 5/2 people are going from 2,080 hours to 2,020. The Monday through Friday people are not really working that much more than they are and she also noted that there are some Monday through Friday people that work eight hours a day but do not get paid for their lunch although they are allowed to leave their work stations. Von Haden noted that they are not allowed to leave their work station and when you have the 7.5 hour day for Monday through Friday people they actually work less than they do. They work 1,893 hours.

George Frye

Frye indicated that he heard Mohr talk about how there would have to be 600 pay periods to start the period on the first day they work, but he stated that they only have three groups. There are two groups that work and one group that covers the days off of those groups. He also did not agree that this would involve 600 people because the only people he sees at the meetings are correctional officers and dispatchers and one of the dispatchers stated that their personnel staffing was about 60 while his usually averages between 140 – 150.

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Buckley to return to regular order of business. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Van Dyck stated as a citizen there had been a couple things that he heard that concern him, one being employees working long shifts and being tired which could result in them not being able to perform at their peak levels. As a citizen this concerns him. He agreed that the issue of compensation was also important but noted that working long hours is not good for anybody.

Evans asked if the Communication Center was down employees and Brent Miller stated that they were although he did not know how many. Evans asked if these were funded positions and it was stated that they are, however they have not been filled. Evans pointed out that a working schedule is a different subject than lack of staff and he stated that lack of staff is not the County Board's fault. He understands that these people are upset that they are working a lot of extra hours and he appreciates their frustration, but said the fact is that money for staffing is in the budget and what needs to be done is for administration to fill the positions. He suggested that HR bring a report to the next meeting to let the Committee know how they are doing on staffing.

Erickson stated that this issue has been going on for several months and it keeps coming back that they work these 5/2, 5/3 schedules but it has never been explained if the schedule also involves moving to different shifts such as from daytime shifts to nighttime shifts. He felt that other scheduling options are available and asked Mohr if there was an absolute reason that the 5/2, 5/3 schedule had to be used. Mohr responded that this is the way it has been done traditionally but Erickson felt that department heads and managers needed to sit down and take a look at scheduling from Sunday through Saturday. He felt this would solve a high percentage of the problems. He also agreed with Evans that many of the overtime issues are a result of not having appropriate staffing. He stated that when budgeted positions sit open and we are using a completely different schedule contradictory to what the work week is, we are causing a lot of problems. He would be willing to sit down with managers and department heads to discuss these things and he felt it would solve a lot of issues.

Wetzel said he has not heard anyone argue that the 5/2, 5/3 schedule is wrong, but it was more of the fact that employees were being asked to come in outside of their schedule but not being compensated appropriately. He did not think a different work week for everyone would be appropriate and felt a standard Sunday through Saturday week could be used, but if an employee would get called in for hours outside of their schedule then they should be compensated at overtime rates. Mohr stated that there is an enormous cost to overtime and Wetzel asked if there was a fiscal impact to show what was being saved by cutting the overtime out as of January 1. He would like to see these figures as soon as possible so this can be resolved.

Streckenbach stated they would like to come back next month to address these things. He would like to have the opportunity to bring fiscal impacts back with different scenarios for consideration. He reiterated what he said earlier that there had been a great deal of work done to get to this current format and stated that it could be amended, but he would like the opportunity to bring figures to the Committee. Streckenbach stated that he recognizes the impact these employees bring to the community and that it is sometimes a difficult situation to work in a 24/7 environment, and he wanted to make sure people are being compensated appropriately.

Wetzel stated that he would like the fiscal impact to include what the impact is of being short staffed. With regard to the short staffing issue, Streckenbach reminded the Committee that there is a long learning curve to bring someone one to do an adequate job. He did not have any doubt of the ability of the staff to perform their tasks but he did realize there are concerns. He wants to continue these dialogues to come up with something that is manageable for both the employees and the County.

Buckley said that it had been indicated that the amount of money being discussed for overtime is an enormous amount of money, but he wanted to know specifically what the amount was. Mohr stated that he recollected that if the County was to go back to the overtime for hours worked after eight hours it would be cost close to \$1 million dollars. Buckley wanted to know if that included the savings from the empty positions and Mohr pointed out that coverage is still being provided for open positions. Mohr stated that the average salary at the Communication Center was \$55,000 and there are some people that cost nearly \$90,000 with benefits. Buckley stated that this would not increase the costs of benefits but Mohr disagreed and said that WRS contributions, social security and FICA are all paid based on salaries.

Buckley continued that as supervisors he felt that the Board does have somewhat of a responsibility in this issue because we do make policies that affect the employment of the County. He was concerned about losing employees because this issue is dragging on. He felt that the employees, especially new employees, are getting burned out and will end up quitting. It was indicated that the Communication Center has not been fully staffed in 17 years and Buckley felt this was a problem and the issues are becoming worse. He stated that there has been more turnover in the last year than in years past. He also stated that not any person can do these 24/7 jobs and you have to find someone with a passion to do them. He felt if we do not treat the good employees we do have right, we will not be able to retain them. He understands we need to look at the scheduling, but he also urged the Committee to keep in mind that some schedules will end up increasing the number of staff needed.

Motion made by Supervisor Buckley to go back to overtime after eight hours worked and move forward. *No second, no vote taken.*

A number of different scenarios were discussed at this time and Buckley stated that if employees are forced to work outside their normal hours, barring training, they should be paid time and a half.

Van Dyck understood Buckley's frustration with the length of time this issue has been drawn out acknowledged that not getting to an answer is bothersome. He did not feel, however, that trying to make a decision when there are numerous ramifications for any decision that is made without any kind of budgetary numbers or any other kind of fiscal impact is prudent. He stated he would be comfortable with having staff provide answers within 30 days so a decision can be made. He understood that that would mean another delay, but he did not feel that making this amendment and decision at this meeting is something he would support at the County level because it had been thrown together too quickly and without appropriate information. He urged the Committee to take the time necessary and refer it back to staff and have them meet further to come back with something concrete.

Lund suggested that the motion be made, and then the fiscal impact be requested and if there is no fiscal impact by the time of the County Board meeting, then there would not be a vote. Moynihan stated that if this motion is passed tonight it will appear on the County Board agenda. Lund stated he understood and said that the fiscal impact should be asked for in the motion.

Human Services Director Brian Shoup felt the prudent thing to do is to look at this from a cost standpoint. He also stated that he is not addressing issues in departments other than his own but he understood the challenge of finding dollars to cover these things.

Williams stated that if the Communication Centers was, for instance, understaffed by five people, those five spots have to be covered. They are not creating any more spots, but there are just those spots that are open. Those open spots would be covered with overtime which costs more than paying someone their wages and benefits. He felt that the emphasis should be on getting the department up to full staffing which would significantly reduce overtime.

Moynihan reiterated that this is a living document. He also stated that administration would have to come back with additional language under 4.57 specific to the groups. He felt if employees are getting called in they should be paid accordingly in overtime.

**Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve chapter 4 as presented and also have administration provide the fiscal impact under 4.57 in regard to forced overtime over 8 hours and have those numbers be presented at the next regular Executive Cmte meeting. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED 5-2.
Ayes: 5 (Moynihan, Lund, Erickson, Wetzell, Fewell)
Nays: 2 (Buckley, Evans).**

The committee returned to item #6 at this time.

24. **Resolution re: Change in Table of Organization Information Services – Delete Technology Services Manager / Add Server, Storage and Virtualization Specialist.**

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

25. **Resolution re: Change in Table of Organization Human Services – Delete Administrative Assistant I / Add Clerk IV.**

Motion made by Supervisor Evans, seconded by Supervisor Moynihan to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

26. **Resolution to Authorize Use of Funds to Retain Outside Counsel.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Wetzell to approve. Vote taken. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED.

27. **Such other matters by authorized by law.**

Motion made by Supervisor Moynihan, seconded by Supervisor Erickson to adjourn at 10:22 p.m. MOTION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED

Respectfully submitted,

Alicia A. Loehlein
Recording Secretary

Attachment 1




Meeting: Village Board
Meeting Date: 6/11/12
Agenda Item:

Mission Statement
Delivering quality services in a courteous,
cost-effective and efficient manner.

VILLAGE BOARD MEETING STAFF REPORT

REPORT TO: President Burt McIntyre & Village Board of Trustees

REPORT FROM: Ed Janke
Executive Director of Public Safety

REVIEWED BY: 

AGENDA ITEM: Review and Take Action on an Agreement with the Wisconsin Department of Transportation to Purchase a Rapid Intervention Vehicle

ACTION REQUESTED: ☐ Ordinance ☐ Resolution ☒ Motion ☐ Receive/File

POLICY ISSUE

- 1) Does the Village Board desire to accept grant money from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation in the amount of \$175,000.00 to purchase a "Rapid Intervention Vehicle" that will be used primarily to mitigate emergencies in the US 41/STH 29 corridor?

RECOMMENDED ACTION BY VILLAGE BOARD

Village staff recommends the Village Board approve the grant proposal. If the Village Board is in favor of approving the grant, the following motion may be made:

"I move to approve State Project ID 1133-03-09 Contract Number 1 awarding the Village of Howard \$175,000.00 to purchase a Rapid Intervention Vehicle."

POLICY ALTERNATIVE(S)

The Village Board could take the following action:

- Table the item and request additional information.
- Not approve the grant award.

STRATEGIC PLAN RELEVANCE:

Economic Vitality:	Yes
Accountable/Efficient Gov't:	Yes
Enhance Gov't Partnerships:	Yes
Environmentally Friendly:	Yes

STRATEGIC PLAN SYNOPSIS:

The roadway reconstruction of U.S. 41 and STH 29 will challenge the current capabilities of the Fire Department. The Rapid Intervention Vehicle will allow efficient, effective emergency response to incidents in this corridor.

POLICY REFERENCE

Wisconsin Statutes: §61.65

Howard Municipal Code: §§20-57-1 and 2, 20-91

Policies & Procedure Manual: N/A

KEY METRICS SYNOPSIS

All key metrics are included within the budget document. The budget policies establish guidelines that may affect key metric reporting or standards.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION

FISCAL IMPACT:

4. Is There A Fiscal Impact? Yes
5. Is It Currently Budgeted? Yes
6. If Budgeted, Which Line? Entire budget

FISCAL SYNOPSIS:

The budget policies are used in aiding staff in budget preparation for 2011 and, therefore, will affect all of the 2011 budget document.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Since 2008, staff has been attending Wisconsin Department of Transportation (DOT) meetings regarding the U.S. 41, STH 29 reconstruction project. During these meetings, DOT Officials outlined construction diagrams, timelines and processes. Due to the projected traffic congestion and limited access, Fire Department staff conducted a situation and gap analysis considering current resources available to the fire department.

The situation analysis revealed that during peak traffic hours, the highway corridors in the Village of Howard area are already congested; challenging safe and efficient public safety operations in these corridors. Furthermore, the analysis suggested predictably, that additional congestion will result with the reconstruction project as well as an increase in emergency incidents within the corridor.

The gap analysis revealed that the Fire Department is not equipped to effectively manage the risks associated with the breadth and depth of this project. Highway emergencies with unfamiliar traffic patterns, limited space and highly congested corridors will challenge the current capabilities of the fire department. The Howard Fire Department does not have apparatus that is designed to control flammable liquid fires, technical hydraulic extrication and traffic management in situations where limited, uneven or off-road access is necessary.

To provide the resources necessary for Howard Fire Department personnel to effectively and efficiently manage highway related incidents considering the complications that this reconstruction project will present, response strategies and resources were studied. Staff determined that a vehicle specifically designed to manage predictable and likely scenarios for this 7 year project should be considered.

Staff approached DOT Officials to determine the feasibility of a DOT funded vehicle designed to mitigate highway related emergencies. A justification was submitted to DOT which was approved by the DOT Secretary.

The Rapid Intervention Concept (RIV) will allow Howard Fire Department personnel to have access to emergency scenes and allow quick-clearance of traffic incidents. This fire apparatus is designed specifically to operate in confined traffic environments, equipped with the tools necessary to quickly mitigate highway related events.

The RIV would provide:

- Versatile, agile, quick response to highway related events.
- Water and dry chemical fire suppression capability.
- Technical rescue capability.
- Traffic incident management capability.

The RIV will be equipped with:

Hoses, nozzles, hydraulic rescue tools, firefighting tools, foam, oil dry, brooms, shovels, lighting, tarps, jaws of life, miscellaneous rescue tools and a thermal imaging camera.

The vehicle is projected to cost \$250,000 fully equipped. DOT is reimbursing the Village of Howard \$175,000. Through equipment and tools already available, the budgetary impact to the Village is likely to be less than \$20,000 from the capital fund.

ATTACHED INFORMATION

- a. Agreement between Wisconsin DOT and the Village of Howard including attachment A.

STAFF REPORT E-MAILED TO:

N/A



REPORTS OF VILLAGE OFFICIALS - DIR. ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

i. April 2012 Financial Report

REPORT PREPARED BY: Chris Haltom

REPORT DATE: May 10, 2012

Enclosed is the financial report for the first four months ending April 30, 2012 with comparative data for 2011 and 2010 for the General Fund and the golf course.

Being very early in the year, it is difficult to draw any conclusion on an estimate for the entire 2012 year. The General Fund appears to be in good shape for the first four months of 2012 when compared to the two previous years. Revenues are slightly behind the total budgeted amount when compared to the percentage of budget in 2011 and 2010. Tax revenues noted collections at a lower rate than 2011 (65.34% in 2012 compared to 73.05% in 2011 and 66.27% in 2010) but keep in mind, the county pays the remaining 100% of all real property taxes to the village in August. In 2010, Charges for Service included over \$230,000 of recycling can revenue which skewed this category.

Expenditures appear to be good shape so far in 2012. All of the expenditure functions are tracking at expected levels of spending for the first four months when compare to previous years.

Great news...financial results for the golf course through April 30, 2012 show very positive results. Operating income is at the highest level through April 30 in the past five years. Two factors are major contributors to these results: 1. Golf course opened in March with excellent weather for golfing in both March and April. 2. Renting the restaurant facilities to Coaches Corner allowed the village to see \$7,600 of operating income.

The month of March had several excellent golfing days. In an attempt to get more golfers, very low spring rates ranging from \$8 to \$12 was established which helped bring in many more golfers than any previous year for March. Good weather continued for most of April.

By renting the facilities to Coaches Corner, the village was able to greatly reduce expenses (eliminating the golf course manager position which was funded ½ by restaurant and ½ by golf) for the golf course. During the first four months of 2011, the golf course manager wages continued; afterwards, unemployment for the course manager and former greens keeper continued in 2011 for almost the entire year. Both of those unemployment costs so far have been eliminated in 2012.

Renting the facility yielded income from the restaurant operations of \$7,600. When viewing prior year restaurant results for the first four months, the best comparative year would be 2010 where the village earned \$1,282 from the restaurant. The rental income is guaranteed profit and will yield \$26,400 for 2012.

VILLAGE OF HOWARD
Statement of Revenues and Expenditures
Budget and Actual - General Fund
Four Months Ended April 30, 2012, 2011 and 2010
(Unaudited - For Internal Use Only)

	2012			2011			2010		
	Actual	Budget	Actual as Percentage of Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual as Percentage of Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual as Percentage of Budget
Revenues									
Taxes	\$ 2,497,893	\$ 3,822,650	65.34%	\$ 2,731,426	\$ 3,739,150	73.05%	\$ 2,451,865	\$ 3,699,550	66.27%
Intergovernmental	396,116	1,426,600	27.77%	438,508	1,722,200	25.46%	460,240	1,758,200	26.18%
Licenses and permits	173,845	404,600	42.97%	121,931	295,600	41.25%	108,797	286,400	37.99%
Fines and forfeitures	88,702	183,000	48.47%	89,853	183,000	49.10%	75,593	183,000	41.31%
Charges for services	33,210	172,200	19.29%	27,796	180,300	15.42%	281,680	420,300	67.02%
Miscellaneous	161,579	448,300	36.04%	165,289	391,200	42.25%	144,966	434,100	33.39%
Total revenues	3,351,345	6,457,350	51.90%	3,574,803	6,511,450	54.90%	3,523,141	6,781,550	51.95%
Expenditures									
General government	347,647	921,950	37.71%	348,778	907,150	38.45%	348,837	1,032,750	33.78%
Public safety	730,153	2,594,400	28.14%	726,270	2,552,400	28.45%	675,024	2,493,800	27.07%
Public works	699,499	2,666,800	26.23%	805,847	2,638,700	30.54%	1,039,390	2,875,500	36.15%
Community development	115,508	428,200	26.98%	135,635	513,200	26.43%	132,592	495,800	26.74%
Total expenditures	1,892,807	6,611,350	28.63%	2,016,530	6,611,450	30.50%	2,195,843	6,897,850	31.83%
Excess revenues over expenditures	1,458,538	(154,000)		1,558,273	(100,000)		1,327,298	(116,300)	
Other Financing Sources (Uses)									
Operating Transfers	-	-		-	-		-	96,300	
Excess of Revenues & Other Sources Over (Under) Exp. & Other Uses	\$ 1,458,538	\$ (154,000)		\$ 1,558,273	\$ (100,000)		\$ 1,327,298	\$ (20,000)	

Village of Howard
Village Greens Golf Course
Statement of Revenues and Expenses
Four Months Ended April 30, 2012, 2011, 2010, 2009 and 2008
(Unaudited - For Internal Use Only)

	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008
Operating Revenues					
Restaurant revenues	\$ -	\$ 46,909	\$ 82,607	\$ 81,494	\$ 75,838
Rental income	7,600	-	-	-	-
Revenue from golf course	39,412	6,516	35,996	21,676	3,854
Total revenue	47,012	53,425	118,603	103,170	79,692
Operating Expenses					
Restaurant expenses	-	54,013	81,325	80,523	79,899
Golf course expenses	57,426	78,588	93,032	67,011	62,137
Administrative expenses	3,501	4,360	5,758	9,538	9,423
Depreciation	15,000	12,800	12,800	12,800	15,460
Total expenses	75,927	149,761	192,915	169,872	166,919
Operating income	(28,915)	(96,336)	(74,312)	(66,702)	(87,227)
Nonoperating Revenue					
Interest and other revenue	251	40	89	1,892	6,647
Other revenue	6,600	127,781	-	-	-
Total Nonoperating Revenues	6,851	127,821	89	1,892	6,647
Net Income	\$ (22,064)	\$ 31,485	\$ (74,223)	\$ (64,810)	\$ (80,580)



Meeting: Village Board
Meeting Date: 01/23/2012
Agenda Item: #6b

Mission Statement
Delivering quality services in a courteous,
cost-effective and efficient manner.

VILLAGE BOARD MEETING STAFF REPORT

REPORT TO: Burt R. McIntyre, President
Village Board of Trustees

REPORT FROM: Geoffrey S. Farr, PE, Director of Public Works

AGENDA ITEM: Review and take action on the purchase of a new 1 ton pickup truck, lift gate and arrow board.

POLICY ISSUE

Should the Village Board approve the purchase of a new pickup truck?

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The Village has a 1993 Dodge ¾ ton 4x2 pickup truck that needs to be replaced. The truck has 89,000 miles and is in very bad shape, as the floor boards have rotted out and the bed is coming apart. The truck will be traded in as part of the purchase. The Village received two bids for the 1 ton, 4x4. The truck will be used for hauling equipment and tools and have a lift gate added to lift and transport heavy pavement saws. It will also have a small arrow board to direct traffic around work operations when used as a blocking vehicle.

The truck bids are as follows:

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| • Dorsch Ford \$24,859 minus \$600 trade | \$24,295.00 |
| • Bergstrom Ford \$24,973.04 minus \$1,500 trade | \$23,473.04 |

The lift gate and arrow board bids are as follows:

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------|
| • Casper's Truck Equipment | \$3,380.00 |
| • Olsen Trailer & Body | \$3,327.00 |

Total Package	\$26,800.04
----------------------	--------------------

The truck should be delivered in 90 days, with the lift gate and arrow board installed 45 days later.

PRIOR ACTION/REVIEW

The 2012 budget includes \$35,000 for the purchase of a new pickup truck.

FISCAL IMPACT:

- | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Is There A Fiscal Impact? | <u>Yes</u> |
| 2. Is It Currently Budgeted? | <u>Yes</u> |
| 3. If Budgeted, Which Line? | <u>Street capital</u> |
| 4. Amount? | <u>\$26,800.04</u> |

RECOMMENDED ACTION

Village staff recommends that the Village Board approve the purchase of a new 1 ton pickup, arrow board and lift gate.

If the Village Board agrees with this action, the following motion could be used, ***"Motion to approve the purchase of a new 1 ton pickup truck with lift gate and arrow board for \$26,800.04"***.

POLICY ALTERNATIVE(S)

The Village Board could take the following actions:

- Approve the purchase
- Deny the purchase
- Table the purchase and request additional information

ATTACHED INFORMATION

- I. None

COPIES FORWARDED TO:

- I. None

July 9, 2012

Dear Chairman Lund and members of the Executive Committee of the Brown County Board of Supervisors,

My apologies for not being able to attend tonight's Executive Committee meeting and taking part in the discussion about a special visioning session or series of visioning sessions and possibly putting together a Master Plan to guide the work of County Government. Unfortunately, my full-time job requires that I be out of town at a conference this week and thus my absence.

I ask that this letter be publicly read into the official record of the meeting, and that the attached sheet be shared with the members of the committee. The sheet is a short summary of the information I've gathered in discussions with staff from the Brown County UW extension and from the Wisconsin Counties Association. Supervisor Wetzel has also gathered some very good information as we prepared for this evening's meeting.

In this summary, you'll find:

1. A listing of a few other municipalities that have done strategic planning, including Brown County departments, other counties in Wisconsin, and some municipalities outside Wisconsin (thanks to Supervisor Wetzel for these last two examples)
2. Some elements of a longer-term strategic planning process that was common among many of the communities I looked at
3. Resources that we could utilize if we decide to do some kind of visioning and/or planning process, including staff from UW extension and the Wisconsin Counties Association
4. A list of questions that might be considered as we decide whether or not to start this kind of effort.

Obviously it is up to the committee as to what action you take tonight. If you decide to move forward with the discussion tonight, I'm sure Supervisor Wetzel can help with this, as he has been gathering information just as I have. If you decide to defer to the August meeting when I can attend, that is fine, too. I trust the judgment of the committee.

Should you decide not to defer but move the effort forward tonight, I would suggest that you consider whether or not you would like to do some work in preparation for the 2013 budget process. It might be that we have a day-long visioning session, facilitated by one of the resource people listed on the sheet that could possibly:

1. Articulate a vision for where we want to be as a county in the next one to five years, and/or
2. Clarify areas of county government that we want to have as priorities for the coming year.

Ultimately, though, I believe we need to have a longer-term strategic planning process that involves the many stakeholders in the community, that results in a master plan for all areas of government, and that would guide the work of the County for the 2014 budget and beyond.

Again, my apologies for not being able to attend the meeting tonight. Thanks to the committee for considering a strategic planning effort and thanks to Supervisor Wetzel for his work. I look forward to hearing what the committee decides.

Sincerely,
Dan Robinson
Brown County Supervisor, District 19

#5

CHIPPEWA COUNTY
STRATEGIC PLANNING

A. Strategic Goal

Coordinate and collaborate with government entities at all levels to ensure effective and efficient government services

Strategic Objectives

1. Encourage coordination/sharing of services with other government & private sector entities
2. Educate County Board members and other local elected officials about how different units of government operate/function
3. Develop open communication with government at all levels

B. Strategic Goal

Strive to enhance our internal operations to better address future needs

Strategic Objectives

1. Review all departments for efficiencies and opportunities to work together more effectively
2. Enhance citizen involvement in County government-encourage competition for elections and volunteerism
3. Clarify the role and structure of the County Board

C. Strategic Goal

Address the fiscal challenges of Chippewa County Government while providing the right mix and level of public service

Strategic Objectives

1. Promote economic development that contributes to a stable or growing tax base (better utilization of business parks)
2. Analyze and prioritize County's spending including additional ways to fund services and privatization of some services
3. Negotiate labor costs and union contracts

D. Strategic Goal

Provide a safe, healthy, and prosperous environment for Chippewa County employees, clientele, and citizens

Strategic Objectives

1. Promote a strong economy (jobs and incomes for Chippewa County residents)
2. Maintain and improve public safety/law enforcement
3. Manage and protect the County's natural resources for the future including water, forests, etc.

Brown County Strategic Planning

A few examples of other municipalities that have done strategic planning

- In Brown County
 - Port of Green Bay (2010)
 - Solid Waste (2012)
- In Wisconsin
 - Adams County
 - Chippewa County
 - Ozaukee County
 - Sauk County
 - Shawano County
 - Village of Hortonville
- Outside Wisconsin
 - Peoria County, IL
 - Colorado Springs, CO

Possible Elements in a strategic planning process

- Evaluating current state of Brown County government
- Gathering input from various sectors of the community (e.g., community members, businesses, non-profit organizations, other elected officials, other resources available to the Board such as the Brown County 20/20 document, etc.)
- Articulating a Vision and Mission for the County
- Setting Goals for the next few years based on the Vision and Mission
- Deciding on objectives that concretely move the County towards the goals
- Putting together measures that evaluate progress on the goals and objectives

Resources

- Wisconsin Counties Association
- UW Extension (both Brown County and state's Local Government Center)
- Brown County Planning Department
- Private consultants (e.g., Diane Chamness, from Milwaukee)
- Many printed resources (e.g., WCA and UW Extension publications)

Questions to be answered

- What would be the desired outcome of this effort?
 - Short-term input that would guide budget process for 2013?
 - Long-term plan that would guide county government?

- Combination of the two?
- One-time event or more-involved process?
 - Time commitment?
 - Openness of the supervisors?
 - What goal are we trying to accomplish?
- Who would facilitate?
 - External or internal?
 - UW Extension? WCA?
 - Brown County planning department?
- How much money could we commit to this effort? Is that adequate for the task?
- Who do we want to involve?
 - Just the supervisors?
 - County staff?
 - General public?
 - Other organizations, businesses, etc.?
 - Reports from other efforts? (e.g., 20/20 report?)
- How do we want to propose something to the Board?
 - One option?
 - A menu of options?
 - A description of possibilities and get more feedback?

OZAUKEE COUNTY – STRATEGIC PLANNING

Four Phase Plan for the Implementation of Ozaukee County Strategic Planning Process

Phase I – Process Design and County Board Approval

- Chairman and Vice Chair develop Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee
 - Comprised of County Board members who are supportive of strategic planning efforts, i.e., 'cheerleaders'
 - Ad Hoc reports to Executive Committee
 - Builds consensus among County Board membership and Department Heads
 - Committee charged with the development and review of strategic planning process
 - Establishes purpose and significance of effort for Ozaukee County
 - Establishes timelines
 - Develops presentation for County Board policy meeting
 - Ad Hoc Committee forms Citizen Input Committee: each Ad Hoc member selects an Ozaukee County citizen to add the public perspective to process.

Phase II – Review of County Mandates and Mission

- Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee reviews County Mission and Mandates
 - Establishing what we do, and why we do it?
 - Visioning – where do we want to be?

Phase III – Identification of Countywide Strategic Issues

- Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee develops SWOT analysis survey to identify strategic issues facing County
 - Survey distributed to each County Board Member, Department Head, and Citizen Input Committee Member
 - **Important to include Department Heads to gain 'buy-in'
- Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee analyzes strategic issues and categorizes all issues into 5-10 strategic areas of focus
- Strategic Planning Ad Hoc Committee presents strategic areas to County Board, Department Heads, and Citizen Input Committee Members at off-site meeting
 - Meeting goal is to develop consensus on strategic areas of focus

Phase IV – Development of Strategy, Long-Term Goals, and Strategic Plan

- Ad Hoc begins strategy discussions to address strategic areas.
 - Strategic areas of focus assigned to appropriate Standing Committee(s) to refine long-term goals and set course to achieve them, i.e., action plans
- Plan Presented to County Board at off site meeting for review
- Plan approval.

PROPOSED APPOINTEES STRATEGIC PLANNING AD HOC COMMITTEE

Supervisor Dan Becker – Chairperson
Supervisor David W. Barrow III – Vice Chairperson
Supervisor Cindy G. Bock
Supervisor Thomas H. Richart
Supervisor Jennifer K. Rothstein
Supervisor Jean Stern
Supervisor Gustav “Sandy” Wirth Jr.

RFP for Central Library Final Design

Background. The County Board has bonded ~~\$1,535,000~~ for the purpose of design services for repair ~~and or~~ renovation of the Central Library. The next step is for the County to issue an RFP (Request for Proposal) for professional services to provide design and consulting services.

RFP Scope. As a result of discussions with the appropriate stakeholders, tThe selected vendor contractor will deliver the detailed design of the proposed renovated Central Library with a focus on reducing the Pre-Design cost estimate of \$23.4 million. ~~to a range of \$16 to 18-17 million, plus or minus \$1 million,~~

The final design costs shall include the following:

1. Base cost for all necessary repairs to bring facility up to code including ADA requirements.
2. Costs for required elements.
3. Costs for desired elements.

~~while retaining the required elements, and as many desired elements as possible through a process that involves the appropriate stakeholders.~~ The design process must include input from the Library Board, Library, County Public Works Facility Management, County Supervisors, and the community. The design must retain the most critical elements of the Pre-Design that will result in a fully functional, safe, energy efficient and technologically proficient 21st century library for Brown County residents, incorporating the current and future needs for several decades to come.

RFP Approval Process.

- Development, Planning and Facilities Committee – June 25
- Administration Committee – June 28
- Education & Recreation Committee – July 2
- Executive Committee – July 9
- County Board – July 18

RFP Review and Selection Committee

- Pat Wetzal, Chair ~~or John Van Dyke~~ Education and Recreation
- Doug Marsh, County Facilities Department
- Chuck Lamine, County Planning Department
- Kathy Pletcher, Library Board
- Lynn Stainbrook, Library Director

RFP Timeline Summary

- RFP Posted July 20
- Responses due August 13
- Intent to award August 30
- Contract signed September 14

Project Management Team for Design

- Bernie Erickson & Norbert Dantine, Development, Planning and Facilities Committee
- John Van Dyck & Erik Hoyer, Education and Recreation Committee
- John Hickey & Kathy Pletcher, Library Board
- Lynn Hoffman, Library Department, plus one-two additional library staff
- Facilities representative

Chapter 4 Revision Proposal

The proposed revisions to Chapter 4 are being submitted for your consideration. The County Executive and management staff have met several times on the current Chapter 4 document and have reached consensus on the proposed revisions. Following is a summary of the revisions as outlined in the attached document:

4.02 Purpose

Verbiage added that Chapter 4 does not create a binding contract between Brown County and its employees.

4.25 Policy

Technical correction, changing the word "company" to "County."

4.40 Nepotism

Added verbiage to include family members within the scope or control, directly or indirectly supervised. The Human Resources Manager will determine if the employment would be detrimental to Brown County.

4.49 Extra Pay

(1) Shift differential is for non-exempt employees, for positions scheduled to work multiple shifts, and 2nd and 3rd shifts receive shift differential pay. The shift times will be determined by the department – not determined county-wide for specific timeframes. The shift schedules and pay differentials will need to be in an approved County/Department policy format.

4.51 Status Changes

(1) The reference to "probationary" was changed to initial employment period. (Here and throughout.)

4.54 Breaks

(1) Unpaid breaks are 30 minutes in length. The 20 minute break has been removed.
(2) Paid breaks which allow employees to leave the premise pose a risk and could impose significant economic loss for Brown County. Employees may take a paid 15 minute break but are not allowed to leave the work area. If an employee chooses to leave the work area, the employee will be on an unpaid break.

We recognize that there are current practices that are counter to this proposed change. Management is committed to working through the changes with the concerns that will likely surface.

4.56 Exempt Employees

The Fair Labor Standards Act defines exempt employees. Changes were made to clarify the sentence to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

4.57 Overtime and Compensatory Time

(1) Policy was changed to include wording to coincide with the Fair Labor Standards Act.
(4) Added that employees called-in will be guaranteed a minimum of two hours of work.

4.59 Exempt Employees

(3) Removed this section. The wording may be interpreted to be in conflict with Fair Labor Standards Act.

(4) Removed the last two sentences as the wording may be interpreted to be in conflict with Fair Labor Standards Act.

4.65 Holidays

(1) Problems continue to exist for the administration of ½ day holidays. This proposal eliminates the three half day holidays (Good Friday, Christmas Eve, and New Year Eve), replacing with full days on Christmas Eve and New Year Eve. (Reduced Bereavement Leave – see 4.68 noted below.)

(2) Removed the additional pay for exempt employees on holidays worked. Non-exempt employees will receive a holiday premium pay of .5 for hours worked. All eligible employees will receive holiday pay equal to their normal schedule up to 8 hours per holiday.

(3) Removed the section as it was duplicative of #2.

(4) Holidays will be midnight to midnight. References to the multiple shift scenarios were removed.

(5) Personal Days

Add 5.c indicating that unused personal days are lost.

4.68 Bereavement Leave

(1) Removed all reference to five days and reduced bereavement leave to three days.

(4) Removed definitions for part-time employees.

(5) Added this section to allow department heads/employees to contact Human Resources for any exceptions to this policy.

4.69 Worker's Compensation

State law dictates worker compensation benefit requirements. Reduced this section to one line, to state that Brown County will follow the requirements of State law.

4.71 Short-term Disability Insurance

Reduced this section to state that Brown County will follow the policy in effect. The plan design and benefits are approved by Administration Committee/County Board and may be amended per current market conditions, economic impact, and industry changes. This allows for policy changes to be made without the revision of county code.

4.72 Long Term Disability

Reduced this section to state that Brown County will follow the policy in effect. The plan design and benefits are routinely approved by Administration Committee/County Board and may be amended per current market conditions, economic impact, and industry changes. This allows for policy changes to be made without the revision of county code.

4.74 Leaves of Absence

(1) Policy – added collaboration with the Department Head when granting a leave of absence. As currently stated the department is not consulted.

4.78 Employee Performance Evaluations

Changed “probationary” to Initial Employment Period.

4.85 Corrective Action, Layoff, Terminations

Corrective Discipline was changed to Corrective Action for consistency.

4.86 Grounds for Discipline

Added Corrective Action or Discipline, as both would reference this listing. It was also noted that the list was not intended to be all-inclusive.

4.88 Layoffs

Changed "probationary" to Initial Employment Period.

4.90 – 4.94 Grievance Procedure

This entire section was struck and replaced with a streamlined version as recommended by representatives of the Wisconsin Counties Association. The recommended Grievance Procedure follows the stricken portion due to the total re-write of the section. The proposed section is in accordance with Act 10.

4.90 Policy – clarifies, per Act 10, that Grievance Procedure defined herein is for terminations, suspensions, and workplace safety.

4.91 Definitions – expanded.

4.92 Timelines and Grievances – timelines are established for both the grieving party and the hearing officer/party.

Step	Current	Proposed
1	Grievance is filed with Department Head.	Grievance is simultaneously filed with Human Resources with a copy to the department head.
2	Grievance is filed with Human Resources.	
3	Grievance is assigned to an Impartial Hearing Officer. HR requests an arbitrator from WERC.	Grievance is heard by an Impartial Hearing Officer.
4	Appeals are heard by the Executive Committee.	
5	Appeals are heard by the County Board.	Appeals are heard by the County Board.

4.93 The Powers and Response of the Impartial Hearing Officer are defined.

4.94 Review by Governing Body are defined.

4.102 Conflict of Interest

Added "or has a business or outside employment" to the definition of conflict of interest.

Thank you for your consideration.